



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

518-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

RENAISSANCE HOSPITAL
C/O BURTON & HYDE PLLC
PO BOX 684749
AUSTIN TX 78768-4749

Respondent Name

UNIVERSAL UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE CO

Carrier's Austin Representative Box

Box Number 19

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-06-0929-01

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "...the fair and reasonable reimbursement amount for this hospital outpatient admission should be commensurate with the average amount paid by all insurance carriers in the Texas workers' compensation system in the same year as this admission for those admissions involving the same Principal Diagnosis Code and Principal Procedure Code."

Amount in Dispute: \$2,988.33

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: The respondent did not respond to the request for medical fee dispute resolution.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
February 3, 2005 to February 14, 2005	Outpatient Services	\$2,988.33	\$0.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, Volume 27 *Texas Register*, page 4047, requires that "Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, §413.011 until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission."
3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to

ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.

4. This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on September 26, 2005. Pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3), effective January 1, 2003, Volume 27 *Texas Register*, page 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, the Division notified the requestor on October 10, 2005 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.
5. U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Michael Lynn issued a "STIPULATION AND ORDER GRANTING RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY TO PERMIT CONTINUANCE AND ADJUDICATION OF DISPUTED WORKERS COMPENSATION CLAIMS BEFORE THE TEXAS STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS," dated August 27, 2010, in the case of *In re: Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, Inc. d/b/a/ Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, et al.*, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division in Case No. 08-43775-7. The order lifted the automatic stay to allow continuance of the claim adjudication process as to the workers' compensation receivables before SOAH, effective October 1, 2010. The order specified John Dee Spicer as the Chapter 7 trustee of the debtor's estate. By letter dated October 5, 2010, Mr. Spicer provided express written authorization for Cass Burton of the law office of Burton & Hyde, PLLC, PO Box 684749, Austin, Texas 78768-4749, to be the point of contact on Mr. Spicer's behalf relating to matters between and among the debtors and the Division concerning medical fee disputes. The Division will utilize this address in all communications with the requestor regarding this medical fee dispute.
6. By letter dated August 2, 2011, the attorney for the requestor provided *REQUESTOR'S AMENDED POSITION STATEMENT (RENAISSANCE HOSPITAL – HOUSTON)* that specified, in pertinent parts, an "Additional Reimbursement Amount Owed" of \$511.75 and an "alternative" "Additional Reimbursement Amount Owed" of \$189.84. The Division notes that the amount in dispute of \$2,988.33 specified above is the original amount in dispute as indicated in the requestor's *TABLE OF DISPUTED SERVICES* submitted prior to the *REQUESTOR'S AMENDED POSITION STATEMENT*.
7. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:
 - 62:*W – RC *W Payment denied/reduced for absence of, or exceeded, pre-certification/authorization.

Findings

1. The respondent denied disputed services with reason code 62:*W – "RC *W Payment denied/reduced for absence of, or exceeded, pre-certification/authorization." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.600(b), effective March 14, 2004, Volume 29 *Texas Register*, page 2349, states, in pertinent part, that "The carrier is liable for all reasonable and necessary medical costs relating to the health care required to treat a compensable injury: (1) listed in subsection (h) or (i) of this section, only when the following situations occur: (A) an emergency, as defined in §133.1 of this title (relating to Definitions); (B) preauthorization of any health care listed in subsection (h) of this section was approved prior to providing the health care..." §134.600(h)(2) states that the non-emergency health care requiring preauthorization includes "outpatient surgical or ambulatory surgical services..." Review of the submitted information finds no documentation to support that the health care provider obtained preauthorization for the disputed services prior to providing the health care. Nor was documentation found to support a medical emergency. This denial code is supported.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(e)(2)(B), effective January 1, 2003, Volume 27 *Texas Register*, page 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires that the request shall include "a copy of each explanation of benefits (EOB)"... "relevant to the fee dispute or, if no EOB was received, convincing evidence of carrier receipt of the provider request for an EOB." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the request does not include a copy of the EOB detailing the insurance carrier's response to the request for reconsideration. Nor has the requestor submitted convincing evidence of carrier receipt of the provider request for an EOB. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(e)(2)(B).
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(A), effective January 1, 2003, Volume 27 *Texas Register*, page 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including "documentation of the request for and response to reconsideration (when a provider is requesting dispute resolution on a carrier reduction or denial of a medical bill) or, if the carrier failed to respond to the request for reconsideration, convincing evidence of the carrier's receipt of that request." Review of the submitted evidence finds that the requestor has not provided documentation of the insurance carrier's response to the request for reconsideration or convincing evidence of the carrier's receipt of that request. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(g)(3)(A).

4. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(B), effective January 1, 2003, Volume 27 *Texas Register*, page 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including “a copy of any pertinent medical records.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not provided copies of any medical records sufficient to support the services in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(g)(3)(B).
5. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, Volume 27 *Texas Register*, page 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor’s amended position statement asserts that “the fair and reasonable reimbursement amount for this hospital outpatient admission should at least be commensurate with the average amount paid by all insurance carriers in the Texas workers’ compensation system in the same year as this admission for those admissions involving the same Principal Diagnosis Code and Principal Procedure Code.”
 - In support of the requested reimbursement methodology the requestor states that “Ordering additional reimbursement based on the average amount paid system-wide in Texas achieves effective medical cost control because it prevents overpayment... creates an expectation of fair reimbursement; and... encourages health care providers to continue to offer quality medical care to injured employees... Ordering additional reimbursement for at least the average amount paid for a hospital outpatient admission during the same year of service and involving the same Principal Diagnosis Code and Principal Procedure Code ensures that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement... The average amount paid for similar admissions as put forward by the Requestor is based on a study of data maintained by the Division.”
 - Review of the submitted medical bill and the submitted medical records finds no principal procedure code listed for the services in dispute.
 - Review of the submitted documentation finds insufficient information necessary to calculate a reimbursement amount under the methodology proposed by the requestor.
 - The requestor has not supported that payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement of \$511.75 is not supported. The requestor has not demonstrated or presented sufficient documentation to support that the additional amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute.

6. In the alternative, the requestor proposes that “it is also justifiable to order as much in additional reimbursement as is owed under the Hospital Facility Fee Guidelines – Outpatient because the Division’s new fee guidelines, while not in effect at that time, are presumptively fair and reasonable reimbursement under the law and data from the Medicare Outpatient Prospective Payment System for these dates of service is still available for calculating the amount due.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - In support of the alternative requested reimbursement methodology the requestor states that “The data necessary to calculate the Maximum Allowable Reimbursement is readily available from the Medicare Outpatient Prospective Payment System. Therefore, the new fee guidelines as adopted in 28 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 134.403 provide a presumptive measure for the fair and reasonable reimbursement amount.”
 - The requestor did not submit documentation to support the Medicare payment calculation for the services in dispute.
 - The fee guidelines as adopted in 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.403 were not in effect during the time period when the disputed services were rendered.
 - The Division disagrees that the fee guidelines as set forth in §134.403 are “presumptively fair and reasonable reimbursement under the law” for dates of service prior to the date the rule became effective. No documentation was found to support such a presumption under law.
 - While the Division has previously found that Medicare patients are of an equivalent standard of living to workers’ compensation patients (Volume 22 *Texas Register*, page 6284), Texas Labor Code §413.011(b) requires that “In determining the appropriate fees, the commissioner shall also develop one or more conversion factors or other payment adjustment factors taking into account economic indicators in health care and the requirements of Subsection (d)... This section does not adopt the Medicare fee schedule, and the commissioner may not adopt conversion factors or other payment adjustment factors based solely on those factors as developed by the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.”
 - The requestor did not discuss or present documentation to support how applying the proposed payment adjustment factors as adopted in 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.403, effective for dates of service on or after March 1st, 2008, would provide fair and reasonable reimbursement for the disputed services during the time period that treatment was rendered to the injured worker.

- The requestor did not submit nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, or documentation of values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments to support the alternative requested reimbursement.
- The requestor did not support that the requested alternative reimbursement methodology would satisfy the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1.

The request for the alternative additional amount of \$189.84 is not supported. The requestor has not demonstrated or presented sufficient documentation to support that the alternative additional amount requested would provide a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute.

Conclusion

The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amounts sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307. The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

Authorized Signature

_____ Signature	_____ Grayson Richardson Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	_____ March 30, 2012 Date
--------------------	--	--

YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.****

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.